

Serial No. **09/923,359**

Docket No. **K-0311**

Amdt. dated July 10, 2006

Reply to Office Action of March 10, 2006

REMARKS

By the present response, Applicant has canceled claims 1-4, 10-17 and 19-29 without disclaimer. Further, Applicant has amended claims 5, 7, 8, 18, 30 and 32-35 to further clarify the invention. Claims 5-9, 18 and 30-35 remain pending in this application. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

In the Office Action, the abstract of disclosure has been objected to because it contains more than 150 words. Claims 5 and 18-20 have been objected to because of informalities. Claims 7 and 8 have been objected to under 37 CFR § 1.75(c) as being improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Claim 35 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 second paragraph. Claims 5-9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,504,482 (Schreder). Claims 18-20 and 30-35 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,959,577 (Fan et al.).

Specification Objections

The Abstract of the Disclosure has been objected to because it contains more than 150 words. Applicants have submitted a new abstract of the invention that fully complies with PTO requirements. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that these objections be withdrawn.

Serial No. **09/923,359**

Docket No. **K-0311**

Amdt. dated July 10, 2006

Reply to Office Action of March 10, 2006

Claim Objections

Claims 5 and 18-20 have been objected to because of informalities. Claims 19 and 20 have been canceled. Applicants have amended the remaining claims to further clarify the invention and respectfully request that these objections be withdrawn.

Claims 7 and 8 have been objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(c). Applicants have amended these claims to further clarify the invention and respectfully request that these objections be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejections

Claim 35 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 second paragraph. Applicants have amended this claim to further clarify the invention and respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

Claims 5-9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Schreder. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Schreder discloses an automobile being equipped with an inertial measuring unit, an RF GPS satellite navigation unit and a local area digitized street map system for precise electronic positioning and route guidance between departures and arrivals. The system is equipped with RF receivers to monitor updated traffic condition information for dynamic rerouting guidance with a resulting reduction in travel time, traffic congestion and pollution emissions. The system

is also equipped with vehicular superseding controls substantially activated during unstable vehicular conditions sensed by the inertial measuring unit to improve the safe operation of the automobile so as to reduce vehicular accidents, and is further equipped with telecommunication through which emergency care providers are automatically notified of the precise location of the automobile in the case of an accident so as to improve the response time of road-side emergency care.

Regarding claim 5, Applicants submit that Schreder does not disclose or suggest the limitations in the combination of this claim of, *inter alia*, continuously confirming the location of a client's mobile phone set to receive area services, collecting special information required for supply of traffic information in a region through a local content provider network constructed in the region when it is confirmed through a pilot signal transmitted from the client's mobile that the client's phone enters the region, or transmitting the collected information to an Internet Protocol of the client's mobile phone. The Examiner asserts that col. 12, lines 11-38 and col. 10, lines 35 -62 discloses the limitations in this claim. However, Schreder relates to automobile navigation guidance and does not disclose or suggest anything related to a mobile phone of a client. Further, Schreder does not disclose or suggest transmitting collected information to an Internet Protocol of the client's mobile phone, as recited in the claims of the present application.

Regarding claims 6-9, Applicants submit that these claims are dependent on independent claim 5 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding this independent claim.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Schreder does not disclose or suggest the limitations in the combination of each of claims 5-9 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Claims 18-20 and 30-35 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Fan et al. Claims 19 and 20 have been canceled. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections as to the remaining pending claims.

Fan et al. discloses processing position and travel related information through a data processing station and a data network. A GPS receiver is used to obtain a measured position fix of a mobile unit. The measured position fix is reported to a data processing station which associates the reported position to a map of the area. Typically, the measured position of the mobile unit is marked and identified by a marker on the map. The area map is then stored in the data processing station and made available for access by authorized monitor unit that may request a specific map by sending a request through the data network. Upon receiving a request, the data processing unit sends the area map to the monitor unit. Data processing station may also perform a database search for travel related information, such as directions to a gasoline station.

Regarding claim 18, Applicants submit that Fan et al. does not disclose or suggest the limitations in the combination of this claim of, *inter alia*, confirming the present position of the owner's mobile phone by the server network by confirming the base station through which the mobile phone is connected through a channel connected with the mobile phone. The Examiner asserts that Fan et al. discloses confirming the present position of the owner of the terminal who requests information, at col. 3, lines 11-46. However, Fan et al. discloses the mobile unit using a GPS receiver to receive a positioning signal which contains code sequences from a GPS satellite constellation and converting the code sequences into suitable-range information that is transmitted in a query when the mobile unit wishes to request travel-related information. This is not confirming the present position of the mobile phone by confirming the base station through which the mobile phone is connected through a channel connected between the server network and the mobile phone, as recited in the claims of the present application. Instead, Fan et al. discloses the use of a GPS receiver to get pseudo-range information.

Regarding claims 30 and 32, Applicants submit that Fan et al. does not disclose or suggest the limitations in the combination of each of these claims. For example, the Examiner asserts that Fan et al. discloses a database storing information of a standard location registered by the client, information of critical value of a difference in time and space from the standard location and information related with services provided according to the difference in time and space, at col. 4, lines 41-54. However, this portion of Fan merely discloses that the data processing

station switches a database and associated area map storage to process the operators query received in the outbound data package where the database maintains travel-related information. This is not a database storing information of a standard location registered by the client using a mobile phone, as recited in the claims of the present application. Further, these portions of Fan do not disclose or suggest a database storing information of critical value of a difference in time and space from the standard location and information related with services provided according to the difference in time and space. Fan et al. merely discloses searching a database that maintains travel-related information.

The Examiner further asserts that Fan et al. discloses position confirming means for grasping the present position of the client, at col. 3, line 46- col. 4, line 40. However, as noted previously, Fan et al. relates to using a GPS receiver to obtain a measured position fix of a mobile unit. This is not position confirming means for grasping the present position of the client by confirming a base station through which the mobile phone is connected through a channel connected with the mobile phone, as recited in the claims of the present application. According to embodiments of the present invention a position confirming means uses a channel with the mobile phone to confirm a base station through which the mobile phone is connected in order to grasp the position of the client.

Further, the Examiner asserts that Fan et al. discloses time measuring means for counting time exceeding the critical value from the standard location registered by the client, at col. 4,

lines 55-65. However, these portions of Fan merely disclose details regarding the position table 33 shown in Fig. 7 where the measured positions of a mobile phone is represented by a time stamp, latitude value, longitude value, and velocity. This is not time measuring means for counting time exceeding the critical value from the standard location registered by the client, as recited in the claims of the present application. This table does not disclose or suggest counting time exceeding a critical value from a standard location. Moreover, col. 2, line 60-col. 3, line 16, does not disclose or suggest information obtaining means for obtaining information of services set according to the difference in time and space confirmed by the position confirming means and time measuring means.

Regarding claims 31 and 33-35, Applicants submit that these claims are dependent on one of independent claims 30 and 32 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding these claims.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Fan et al. does not disclose or suggest the limitations in the combination of each of claims 18 and 30-35 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Serial No. **09/923,359**

Docket No. **K-0311**

Amdt. dated July 10, 2006

Reply to Office Action of March 10, 2006

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that claims 5-9, 18 and 30-35 are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of such claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, Frederick D. Bailey, at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



John C. Eisenhart
Registration No. 38,128
Frederick D. Bailey
Registration No. 42,282

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3701 JCE/FDB:tlg

Date: July 10, 2006

\\Fk4\Documents\2016\2016-054\96845.doc

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610